

### ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-20 remain in this application. The examiner has acknowledged that claims 14-20 would be allowable if amended to correct errors in the claim. Claims 4-6, 9-11, and 13 would also be allowable if put into independent format.

First, applicant's representative would like the Examiner to reconsider his refusal to consider the reference cited in the supplemental IDS. The Examiner argued that the reference "2002/140373" is not a proper form for an application number. However, it is well-known that leading zeros are understood in a number, if necessary. Furthermore, the inventor and filing dates were listed. Thus, the Examiner should have reviewed "2002/0140373" because it was obvious from the submission that this was the intended document, and it would not have taken any undue effort for the Examiner to determine what was meant by the listed document number. In fact, such an action would have been trivial. Finally, we note that the number was reported exactly as it was received from the European Patent Office search report, and thus the error (if it can be considered an error) was introduced by them. Thus, the Examiner should have considered the reference, and is now requested to do so.

The Examiner objects to the figures for not showing a "constant voltage supply circuit connected to said rectifier circuit" as recited in claim 4. The claim has been amended, making the objection moot.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for using the term "voltage/current". The claims have been amended, making the rejections moot.

Claims 1, 2, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mayer *et al.* (U.S. 6,833,678). Claims 8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Newman Jr. *et al.* (U.S.

6,674,248). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a “phase dimmer compatible circuit including an input rectifier circuit”, and a “keep-alive feedback circuit for feeding back energy from said discharge lamp to said phase dimmer compatible circuit to support a high dimming operation”. Mayer does not teach any such feedback. The circuit cited by the Examiner (C2, J9, J10) clearly does not feed back to any circuit including a rectifier circuit, and thus the claim is patentable over Mayer. Claims 2-4, 6-7, and new claims 21-24, which depend on claim 1, are thus patentable over the reference for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 5 has been amended to put it in independent format. This claim includes limitations that the input rectifier circuit includes “a plurality of diodes operating at a frequency above the frequency of the input voltage, wherein at any given time at least one diode is in a conducting mode due to said keep-alive feedback circuit”, which is not shown by any of the cited prior art references, and thus is patentable over those cited references.

Claim 8, as amended, recites a constant voltage supply circuit which “provides a substantially constant voltage related to one or both of a voltage of said inverter circuit and a voltage of the discharge lamp”. The cat-ear circuit of Newman does not provide a voltage related to the voltages of an inverter circuit or a discharge lamp, and thus is patentable over the references. Claims 9-13, and new claim 25, which depend on claim 8, are patentable over the reference for at least the same reason as the parent claim.

New claim 26 recites a “feedback circuit for feeding back current from the discharge lamp to the phase dimmer compatible circuit in order that the phase dimmer compatible circuit can draw substantially continuous current from the external phase dimmer” which is not shown in the references, and thus is patentable over the references, as are claims 27-30 which depend on claim 26.

New claim 31 recites “a constant voltage supply circuit for providing a substantially constant voltage to the dimming control circuit, said constant voltage relating to one or more of a voltage of said inverter circuit and said

discharge lamp" which is not shown in the references, and thus claim 31 is patentable over the references, as is claim 32 which depends on claim 31.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36287.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East Ninth Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

February 13, 2006